Was Dr. Soblen's Trial Fair? P. 4

The Gomulka Interview Life Magazine Decided Not to Print, P. 2; Counter-Force and Co-Existence, P. 3

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. X, NO. 27 JULY 9, 1962 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

Some Missing Faces in That Mexican Welcome

The President and Mrs. Kennedy are genuinely *simpatico,* and deserved their Mexican triumph. But though the Latins love fiestas, this kind of pageantry should not be mistaken for reality. It is made to order for the big picture magazines but it is not a substitute for the thinking required if we are to maintain friendship in this hemisphere. A useful exercise is to try and see the visit as many Latin Americans will see it. For them it will be symbolic that though Russian and other Soviet envoys were in the diplomatic corps which exchanged greetings with the President on his arrival, the Cuban Ambassador, Carlos Lechuga, was not invited. It is, indeed, difficult to see how they could have met gracefully. But the point is that for all the rhetoric about revolution in Mr. Kennedy's address, when one really happens in this hemisphere we greet it with enmity and try by boycott to isolate and destroy it.

Cuban Sugar and Mexican Oil

The embargo on Cuban sugar recalls all too freshly for Mexicans the world-wide boycott we organized against their oil after Cardenas expropriated the American companies in the 30's, forcing the most anti-Fascist regime in this hemisphere—more friendly than any other to the Spanish Republic—into strange deals with the Axis to find some outlet for its petroleum. Those were the days of FDR's Good Neighbor Policy as these are the days of the *Alianza para progreso,* but Latin Americans have had bitter experience with progressive U.S. administrations. They felt the Big Stick in Teddy Roosevelt's. Wilson constantly interfered after the Mexicans overthrew the long cruel dictatorship of Diaz, and he helped the power-hungry Carranza to take over. Mr. Kennedy praised Mexico's progress in land reform, but when the big step forward came under Cardenas, it was only made possible by a battle with the Church and the oil companies of which the U.S. disapproved; had it not been for the great struggle shaping up in Europe, we might again have sent troops into Mexico. Even today Cardenas, who did more for the poor and landless than any other leader in Mexico's history, even than its Indian Lincoln, Juarez, is regarded with disfavor by the U.S. He, too, was not there for a handshake. We like the revolutions best when they become corrupt and moribund as has Mexico's.

This was not the best backdrop for that passage in Mr. Kennedy's speech where he said, "We do not seek to change or direct any nation's political or economic system." Another passage which will sound differently to them than to us was his reference to "a common determination to preserve the blessings of freedom." Several thousand Mexicans were rounded up for protective custody on the eve of the visit. The famous muralist, Siqueiros, and dozens of labor leaders are still in the jails where Lopez Mateos threw them months ago to break a railroad strike. Political freedom is strictly circumscribed in Mexico today, and our example is not always good. Only a few months ago the State Department refused to let Mexico's brilliant young novelist, Carlos Fuentes, enter this country on invitation of a major TV network for a public debate on Castroism, a subject on which we pull down our own Iron Curtains.

Our Own Latifundistas

Latin American intellectuals may feel more forgiving, however, if they notice that Mr. Kennedy's problems at home are not so different from theirs. We, too, have our *latifundistas,* who thwart democratic aspiration. Tax reform is as difficult here as there; Senator Kerr stands guard over the loopholes that mean millions to the oil and gas barons. Even a minor suggestion for withholding taxes on dividends and interest raises a storm. The effort to rationalize farm price supports fails. Mr. Kennedy is punished because he dared to hold down steel prices after holding down steel wages. The privileged are up in arms because the less fortunate want medical care in their old age. It is only when the rich and powerful approve, as they do on tariff reform, that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce graciously allows our charming young President his one triumph at this session of Congress. Mr. Kennedy is more to be pitied than scorned.

The Prayer We Favor

The tidal wave of piety stirred up by the school prayer decision has engulfed us, too, and we offer a few religious items. We note with admiration how well the President at press conference handled the ticklish question of his own reaction to the Court's ruling. We call attention to the fact that the President of Mexico did not accompany President and Mrs. Kennedy to the Shrine of Guadulupe. "Mexicans said," the Washington Post alone reported, "that it would be in violation of the spirit of the Constitution for President Lopez Mateos to attend mass." Separation of Church and State is sharper there, because every liberating upsurge from Juarez to Cardenas has found the Catholic Church on the side of reaction. That these tendencies are not absent in our own hierarchy was demonstrated when Col. Chas. E. McGee, an Army chaplain, delivered the invocation at Dr. Schwarz's poorly attended "Christian Anti-Communist Crusade" in Madison Square Garden June 28—as Cardinal Spellman's representative! If this inspires prayer, it is prayer to keep Church and State firmly apart here, too.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Henry Luce, Like the Russians, Only Likes to Print What Follows His Line

Gomulka's Views on Co-Existence, and West Germany Not to Life's Taste

(From Gomulka's Rejected Replies to Life)

"There are people who proceed on the assumption that peaceful co-existence among states favors Communists only and—they argue—what favors them, must be contrary to the interests of the capitalist states. This reasoning is behind the policy pursued by many influential quarters in the West which regard our policy of peaceful co-existence as a Communist maneuver. . . . The only alternative to peaceful co-existence is a genocidal destructive war. Such is the challenge of our days. There is no other choice. . . .

"In a sense politics can be likened to technology. If a policy is to be constructive, it must take into account all the realities of the current world situation. . . . But there are countries which have frozen their foreign policies and conduct them or try to conduct them in the seventh decade of our century by means employed during the first few decades of our century. . .

The Reality of Soviet Power

"For many years the United States was the strongest country in the world, thus holding a dominating position. Today there is another power, at least equal in strength, the U.S.S.R. From this fact the U.S. has failed to draw proper conclusions, not recognizing the USSR as an equal partner with whom it is necessary to seek an understanding, while taking into account mutual interests. . . .

"Only a few years ago general and complete disarmament might have appeared as a slogan of pacifists. Today it finds its place in the program of the CPSU and . . . in unanimous resolutions of the United Nations.

"Can anyone seriously suppose that these new and fundamental principles of the Soviet Union and the world Communist movement proclaiming the possibility of avoiding a new world war, peaceful co-existence of States and also the possibility of general disarmament have been adopted by the Communists in other to mislead nations? . . .

"The Soviet Union, together with other socialist states, has in fact evolved its policy, adapted it to the present historical situation. . . . and the hard requirements imposed on all states by the destructive force of nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles. As soon as the West does likewise . . . mutual distrust and the dangers of nuclear war will be dissipated. . . .

"The assurances given by Western statesmen that the Bundeswehr's integration in the armed forces of NATO protects the socialist states from aggression by German militarism are but political fairy-tales. When the German Federal Republic was admitted to NATO, it was still a weak state. Its stronger partners in this Pact could impose their will on her. Today the situation is reversed. It is no exaggeration to say that in NATO the German Federal Republic is in fact only second to the United States. The Bundeswehr has become NATO's principal force in Europe. And this is what counts. Who is strong imposes decisions. . . .

"At present there exists within NATO an intention through this organization to place nuclear weapons at the disposal of the German Federal Republic by transforming NATO into the 'fourth nuclear power.' . . . If such a situation came about it would be much more difficult to turn the world back from the road leading to nuclear catastrophe.

"The Bundeswehr's finger on the pushbutton of the American nuclear weapons would . . . increase its influence on NATO policy, still further encourage German militarists and revanchists, bolster up their aggressive spirit. . . ."

Life's High Cultural Standards

A painful impression has been created in Poland by Life Magazine. Inserted in the issue of June 22 sent to certain advertising agencies, Life placed a special "memo" answering rumors that it had (as Life said) "riveted another bolt on the Iron Curtain" by sending a rejection slip to "a Red premier." According to Life, a manuscript arrived one day from Gomulka which it rejected because it "parroted" the Russian line. The Polish version is that Life sent Isaac Don Levine to Warsaw last November to ask an interview with Gomulka. The latter finally offered to answer written questions. The answers were then rejected. The questions and answers were published July 1 in Trybuna Ludu, Warsaw's leading daily. We give excerpts here from the text distributed by the Polish Embassy in Washington. "Through the years," Life said unctuously in its memo, it had published "the first person views of dozen of world leaders" (it cited Eisenhower, Churchill, Nasser, de Gaulle, Truman and Gen. Van Fleet), but they had to "meet the uncompromisingly high editorial standards made possible by the freedom of our culture." We can imagine the snorts from Life if Izvestia solicited but then declined to print the replies of an American leader on the ground that they did not meet Izvestia's cultural standards! The incident hurt the "liberalizers" in Warsaw, who have spoken well of the U. S. press.

When Asked About Cuba, Laos and Vietnam, Gomulka Made Tart Replies

"Q. Would you favor the cessation, by the USSR and its associates, of supplying arms to incendiary elements in Laos, Vietnam and particularly Cuba, so as to extinguish in those areas the smoldering fires which threaten to consume all mankind in a nuclear conflagration?

"A. Not only do I favor it but . . . the Soviet Union has repeatedly suggested . . . that the two sides refrain from supplying arms to certain regions of the world, to which the West refused to agree. Also, it is noteworthy that arms supplies from socialist countries came, as a rule, in reply to American arms supplies.

"There seems to be a difference between the meaning of the word 'incendiary elements' as interpreted by Life and by myself. Your question implies that the USSR or other socialist countries are supplying arms to incendiary elements in other countries, including Cuba. In actual fact, it is the United States that supplies arms to Cuban counter-revolutionaries. . . . The Government of Fidel Castro received arms from some socialist countries when capitalist countries, having refused to sell arms to him, proceeded to organize counter-revolutionary detachments. . . .

"The civil war in Laos is the outcome of the policies of the previous U.S. Administration. . . . The American intervention in South Vietnam, continuously increasing in scope, arouses growing concern the world over. Finding no support whatever amongst the people of South Vietnam, the local regime maintains itself in power through mass terror. . . ." *—From the Gomulka interview*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

By The Author of "The Limits of Defense": Strategy, Politics and The 19th Century

Balanced Deterrent Implies Co-Existence But Counter Force Nuclear Victory

By Arthur I. Waskow

Now unhappily coexisting within the Kennedy Administration are two opposed views of the world, both out of date. Their coexistence gives us the military Mix and a foreign policy that vacillates between seeking "rollback" and settling for "stalemate." Which element in the military Mix dominates at any one point may be to *angelologists** an index of which foreign policy is coming into ascendancy.

The implication of one of the competing strategies, "counter-force," is that military power or the threat thereof can roll back the Communist empire. The implication of its opposite number, "minimum deterrence," is that unhappily the Communist empire is here to stay and must be accepted as a fact of life.

Discriminating H-Bombs

"Counter-force" suggests that H-bombs can be trained to destroy other H-bombs but let people alone. If two nations try this gambit but one can grow and train a great many more H-bombs than the other, that nation has a "credible first-strike capability." For it can threaten to attack the enemy's forces and destroy them without fear that the far weaker enemy can destroy *its* forces. And since the enemy is of course carefully adhering to the arrangement not to kill people, the nation with a bigger brood of H-bombs can "win" or "prevail" without much damage to itself.

What this means is that in a great crisis the United States, with a counter-force strategy according to Defense Secretary McNamara and with overwhelming thermonuclear power according to Deputy Secretary Gilpatric, can demand a Communist retreat. Obviously, this possibility appeals to those who cry for "total victory." These men are 19th-century Americans in a late 20th-century world. They remember defeating Indians, Britain, Mexico, Spain, and even Germany and Japan. They remember that American free enterprise conquered new territory, won new markets, and had world-wide respect. These descendants of the manifest-destinarians do not understand why the advent of the H-bomb might make difficult the march to far frontiers.

Opposed to these 19th-century Americans are what might be called 19th-century Europeans. They model their foreign policy on the 19th-century balance of power and they scorn the "illusion of American omnipotence" as a dream of youth and innocence. They counsel patience and cunning, the virtues of 19th-century diplomats. They look forward to a world in which the United States is secure but its power limited, the Soviets and Chinese feel secure but their power is contained, and the arts of diplomacy and old-fashioned limited war can be used to settle conflicts of interest.

The preferred strategy of such men is "minimum" or "stable" or "balanced" deterrence. They believe that if each side builds a limited number of thermonuclear missiles, enough to destroy the other side's cities, and if each side carefully makes this limited missile force "invulnerable" to attack, and if neither side tries seriously to protect its populace from attack, then both sides will be "deterred." Neither can strike first without committing suicide as well as murder.

Since minimum deterrence could only be used in response to an H-bomb attack, this strategy would require conventional and commando forces to deal with lesser clashes. Thus the 20th-century weapons would be nullified, instead of being incorporated into the regular arsenal as "counter-force" strategists would urge. And thus the United States would accept a basic world-wide stalemate of opposed imperial powers—like the Kaiser and the Tsar, before 1914.

The bomb, of course, makes the 19th century obsolete—*either in its American or European versions. It is possible to* imagine a policy that would temporarily use the minimum deterrent to preserve a temporary military safety, while redirecting the resources that now need our counter-force weapons. Those resources could go both into the non-military conquest of Space (with inspection invited to prove that the conquest was indeed non-military) and into the provision of liberty and food for the hungry nations. Such a policy would make disarmament much more likely, since it would press the Soviets into non-military forms of competition with us. Such a policy would also break through the stalemate of terror to reduce the military supports for totalitarian states and to win victories for free men.

But unfortunately such a policy belongs in the 20th century. It will therefore not be accepted until the 21st—which is probably too late.

*** Opposite of demonologists; hence, students of power shifts in the White House.**

A Modest Proposal on Guerrillas

The new faddists for "counter-insurgency" and "guerrilla action" hark back to America's frontier days for evidence that we make good guerrillas. They forget that the Green Moutnain Boys were fighting in and for their own country, not in either Viet-Nam or Poland. If this fad for guerrillas continues, we suggest that the idea be tried out in one country that might arouse among some Americans both the zeal for revolution and the identification with the people that the Green Mountain Boys had. The testing ground we propose is South Africa, and of course the guerrillas we suggest are American Negroes.

The guerrillas-to-be might be trained in Mississippi with a few forays, both violent and non-violent, against county sheriffs or local radio stations. The training cadres could be made up of CORE and Black Muslim veterans of action. A series of controlled experiments, comparing the success of violent and non-violent action, could thus be arranged. When training was complete, the new War Corps could be smuggled into South Africa. Then we could announce our intention to aid in the overthrow of the Afrikaaner government on or before July 4, 1970.

Since the Soviet Union does not have a Negro population, it could not match our program; so we would at once win a major propaganda victory. By 1970 we would have a full file on modern guerrilla techniques. It is also probable that till 1970 the attention of civil-rights enthusiasts would be riveted on South Africa, so that American politicians would be happily released from pressure to pass civil rights legislation.—A.W.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Behind the Appeal the Supreme Court Refused to Hear

How the Soblen Trial Fell Below the Highest Standards of Justice

Dr. Robert A. Soblen's story begins with one witch hunt and ends with another. The first was the witch hunt ithin the Communist movement against Trotzkyists. The second was the witch hunt in the United States against Communists. The story is an ugly one. He and his brother, Jack Soble, became Communists in their student days in Germany in the 1920s, were expelled for Trotzkyism in 1929 and then recruited by the GPU to spy on their former Trotzkyist comrades. The story begins with the betrayal of party comrades and ends with the betrayal of the wife and friends who put up $100,000 in bond for him.

It must be admitted however, that his trial and sentence did not conform to the highest standards of justice. The Court of Appeals in upholding his conviction said it thought the sentence imposed upon him "somewhat harsh." His brother was given 7 years, Dr. Soblen life imprisonment. Yet in any other type of prosecution, the statute of limitations would have debarred action and the necessary evidence of intent to obtain American defense secrets was tenuous.

On A Psychotic's Testimony

Two briefs *amicus* were filed on his behalf. A group of psychiatrists wanted the Supreme Court to decide whether a man could be convicted on the testimony of a psychotic. The American Civil Liberties Union wanted the Court to spell out "the full extent of the obligation of government prosecutors to disclose information of value to the defense."

Newly retained counsel on appeal had asked for a new trial on the ground that the defense had been unaware (1) of testimony by a prison psychiatrist that Dr. Soblen's brother was too sick mentally to tell truth from falsehood and (2) of facts which cast doubt on the other key witness, a Mrs. Beker. The plea for a new trial was rejected on the ground that these facts were "readily available to a diligent defender."

One crucial point, however, could not have been unearthed at the time even by diligent counsel. The prosecution withheld the fact that Dr. Hans Hirschfeld, a prominent Socialist official of West Berlin, had denied before a Grand Jury here under oath Mrs. Beker's story that she passed Dr. Soblen a letter from Dr. Hirschfeld during the war saying that the U.S. was working on a new secret weapon. This gave the trial an "atom bomb" angle. The Solicitor General's answer was that "the transcript of Hirschfeld's grand jury testimony would not have been producible since Hirschfeld was not a government witness." But was this a fact the government could honorably withhold?

The Court of Appeals earlier set aside the conviction of Mark Zborowski whom Dr. Soblen's brother, Jack Soble, had named as another member of this same spy ring. The Court ordered a new trial on the ground that the government had withheld from the defense medical reports on Soble's mental illness and inconsistences with his grand jury testimony. Zborowski is to be retried in September. Should Zborowski be acquitted, it would also cast doubt on Dr. Soblen's conviction.

If It Weren't The FBI

Dr. Soblen is the sixth convicted Communist in recent years to skip bail. The first was Gerhart Eisler who fled in 1949 after the Supreme Court refused to hear his appeal from a conviction for contempt of the Un-American Activities Committee. Two years later, four top Communists eluded the authorities and went into hiding after their Smith Act convictions were upheld. Dr. Soblen made his getaway a few days after the Supreme Court turned down his appeal. If he had fled to Russia instead of Israel, his whereabouts might still be unknown, the FBI still looking for him.

If any other agency were involved, we may be sure there would be indignant editorials asking why surveillance was so slack. The FBI boasts a network of informers. It has so many in the Communist Party that sometimes they inform on each other, as came to light in recent Un-American Activities Committee hearings in Cleveland. If it were an agency less sacrosanct, with a chief less the sacred cow than J. Edgar Hoover, there would be demands for an investigation.

Some Birchite might even ask, knowing how devious counter-intelligence becomes: When the Communists are so infiltrated by the FBI, can one be sure the FBI is not just a little infiltrated in return?

Please Specify Which Issue in Sending Envelopes for Free Sample Copies to Friends

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

7/9/62

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except the last Monday in August and the first in September and the last Monday in December and the first in January at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED